C-08091

MONAHAN_MICHAEL_20160126

1/26/2016

Full-size Transcript

Prepared by:

C-08091

Wednesday, February 10, 2016

GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT

-3

17-CR-64 (DWF/KMM)

A No, I don't recall speaking to anybody that expressed those views.

Q Do you recall anyone at Adams Monahan speaking with a shareholder of the Apollo companies who expressed disappointment or anger at the transaction?

A Well, disappointment and anger being two things. I think disappointment at -- it wouldn't surprise me if someone expressed disappointment that the Apollo companies had yet to commercialize the technology, but I don't recall anyone being angry about it. I think everyone understood this was really leading edge, cutting edge science not proven in a commercial state. But because the potential was so large, I think there was disappointment, and that disappointment was throughout the organization, too, from Dr. Linares on down.

- Q How about any disappointment in the purchase price?
- A In the -- which purchase price, the stock purchase price or the -- are you going to the asset purchase price?
- Q The asset purchase agreement price, did any shareholders express disappointment or anger over the price that Private Scio was paying to obtain the assets of either Apollo Diamond, Incorporated or ADGC?
- A I'm unaware of anyone expressing disappointment over the asset purchase price because I believe most, if not all shareholders, understood they were going to own the same assets in a different capital structure, different company, so the

price almost was irrelevant.

2.0

Q Is that your understanding based on conversations with investors or just your understanding based on the transaction?

You know, I'm trying to separate like --

A Yes, I believe I did have conversations with investors, and they understood that, well, I'm going to own the same assets, but I don't have a company that's got, whatever, 80 some odd million shares outstanding, that's in debt, has no cash, and is controlled by a small group of people. It's a better situation. The investors in Apollo companies are successful people and understood business and this transaction. I believe on a large basis they understood it pretty well, and they could see the benefits of it.

Q Apart from the conversations you had with Apollo company shareholders, were you aware of any discussions that anyone else at Adams Monahan had with Apollo company shareholders that expressed disappointment or anger over the purchase price of the asset purchase agreement?

A I'm not aware, no.

Q Okay.

MR. KOPECKY: How many people voted against it?

THE WITNESS: Not many. Two.

MR. KOPECKY: And anyone could have voted against

24 it?

25 THE WITNESS: Yes. Affirmatively voted against it

what they told you.

2.0

A I'm going to. What the Apollo shareholders were most excited about, what mattered to them is that the opportunity would live on, they would have a chance to own a part of a company that was going to exploit the technology, the diamond technology, and that they were going to own it in a company that was capitalized and had a myopic focus on manufacturing versus kind of research and development that Apollo had done a lot of over the years.

And that ability to own the assets in a new entity at no cost to them and in an entity that was free of debt or any other liabilities, had a new management team and a new focus was what they were really looking for. That was expressed to me. This is fantastic, we appreciate the opportunity you guys have facilitated for us to continue to own this diamond technology going forward, we realized it was dead but now it has life and we don't have to pay anything for it.

- Q So the shareholders -- every shareholder you spoke with thought it was dead?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Okay.
- A Yes. And none of them focused on ownership percentage, ultimate ownership percentage, and all of them are sophisticated investors and individuals that understood transactions change, dilution occurs when capital is raised, they understood that.

```
Q The 10-Q, I'm sorry.
```

2.5

A For the period ending 10-31-11, and that would also reflect the monies that Public Scio raised in the initial private offering at 70 cents per share, approximately six and a half million shares. So the capitalization table was 26 million for a round figure, it was below that.

Ultimately an additional 17 million shares were added to the capital table from Apollo Diamond, Inc. and Apollo Diamond Gemstone Corporation shareholders giving a fully capitalized table of 43 million shares, okay.

So a shareholder from Apollo who owned X percent in Apollo in a \$45 million capital structure owned certain assets in an entity with substantial liabilities and no cash and control in the hands of a few people and an illiquid stock in a privately held company. That same person who exercised his or her right to purchase the shares in Public Scio had an increased ownership percentage in an entity that owned the same assets with no debt, cash in the bank and liquidity. That person was much better off in Public Scio than they were in private Apollo Diamond, Inc. in March of 2011.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: And, Jim, I think maybe I misunderstood you. You said -- did you say the 10-K for 3-31-11?

MR. KOPECKY: No, the 10-Q.

MR. WISNIEWSKI: Okay, I thought you said the K. I